

EVERGREEN ♦ EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

Task Force Workshop Meeting - 7

K.R. Smith Elementary School
2025 Clarice Drive
San Jose, CA 95122

Saturday, February 25, 2006
9:00A.M. – 12:30P.M.

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 9:00a.m.

Task Force Members Present:

Chair Dave Cortese, Vice-Chair Nora Campos, Madison Nguyen, Mark Milioto, Mike Hill, Steve Dunn, Bob Levy, Al Munoz, Steven Cox, Khanh Nguyen, Carlos DaSilva, Maria Lopez, Jim Zito, Alan Covington, Homing Yip, Melanie Richardson, J. Manuel Herrera, Jenny Chang, Joe Head, Nancy Dellamattera, Ike White, Vince Songcayawon, Lou Kvitek

Members of the Public Present:

Ana Lomas, Mark Lazzarini, Bob Rivet, Terry Gotcher, Daniel Gould, Carolyn Bushnell, Jody Pabst, Brian Darrow, Debbie Long, Bernice Gould, Ed Abelite, Phillis Wall, Jane Kowalewski, Tom Yang, Candy Richter, Teresa Trinh, Ruben Dominguez, José Aranda, Nikhil Mazumder, Andre Hunt, Kulwant Sidhu, Tony Montagano, Marie Sinatra, Neil Struthers, Rhonda Garcia, Leigh Goldstein, Ellie Glass,

Developer Community Present:

Mike Keaney, Myron Crawford, Bo Radanovich, Menka Sethi, Jim Eller, Gerry DeYoung, James Lindsay, Patrick Spillane, Bridget Koller

Staff Present:

Laurel Prevetti, Kip Harkness, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Manuel Pineda, Mike Meyer, Rebecca Flores, Winnie Pagan, Tei Chen, Sylvia Do, Dave Mitchell, Rabia Chaudhry, Todd Rufo, Maya Esparza, Louansee Moua

Welcome and Introductions:

Vice Chair Campos opened the meeting reminding everyone of the full agenda and the importance of staying on-course.

Chair Cortese added that the workshop would be a two-way dialogue and emphasized the importance of moving the vision forward.

Meeting facilitator Kip Harkness, at the request of Task Force member Alan Covington provided a preview of the meeting including format. Kip first reminded everyone of the meeting ground rules, referring to the ground rules handout, then described the framework for the workshop discussion. Kip outlined three principles for the workshop, any discussion should: 1. relate to the EEHVS, 2. be solutions oriented, 3. deal realistically with “balancing the equation”. He clarified that the preference survey was not a vote or a determination, but rather a first look at what is important and to try to develop a framework for future discussions. At a future Task Force session the Task Force will have the opportunity to improve the framework and describe or recommend how to “balance the equation”.

Kip also noted that the public would have a greater opportunity for participation at this meeting and could also take the preference survey.

Chair Cortese asked how Task Force members could “cross pollinate” on the different topics. Kip answered that at the next session there would be more opportunity to “cross pollinate” and that there would be some ability to do so at the workshop.

Task Force Member Alan Covington made a motion to amend the agenda to include a short presentation by a member of the Task Force.

Laurel Prevetti suggested using Round 1 of the groups exercise for the presentation as long as the presentation would be consistent with the Brown Act.

Task Force member Melanie Richardson asked what the subject of the presentation was.

Task Force member Jim Zito responded that the presentation provided information and a recommendation on unit count, amenities and product type.

Task Force member Joe Head expressed concern with not knowing the content of the presentation and whether the presentation would be equitable.

Alan Covington’s motion was approved by the Task Force providing Jim Zito time to give his presentation after the affordable housing presentation.

Laurel Prevetti referenced a number of handouts that were provided on the EEHVS EIR including the Notice of Availability, EIR Summary, and an EIR handout describing basic information about the EIR including how to comment. Laurel reminded the Task Force and public that the EIR is an informative document, but does not tell how to balance the equation. Any EIR comments should be related to the adequacy and accuracy of how the EIR addresses environmental issues. Any EIR comments should be in writing to Planning staff, focusing on the EIR document and not on the merits of the project. Laurel informed the audience that staff was working with the City Attorneys Office on the ability to convene an informative EIR meeting/presentation for the public.

Affordable Housing Presentation:

Mike Meyer from the City of San José Housing Department provided a presentation on Affordable Housing. (see presentation on EEHVS website).

Task Force Member Jim Zito's Presentation:

Task Force member Jim Zito provided a presentation to the Task Force and public. (see presentation on EEHVS website).

Jim suggested topics that needed to be discussed and questions that needed to be answered. He mentioned a desire to sit down with the developers group to discuss how they arrived at their numbers and why they are different from the EVP Task Force's numbers.

Task Force member Joe Head stated that the implication of the presentation was that the development community provided erroneous or self-serving information. The developers, in good faith, went from 7,000 units to 5,200 units. The developers know their business and that business is not up for public discussion.

Issues Forum/Discussion:

Identify Issues- The Task Force identified the following items they wanted to discuss in Issue Groups Round 1: amenities, unit count, traffic and funding alternatives. For Issue Groups Round 2: Parks/Open Space, Commercial/Industrial, Affordable Housing and Schools.

Issue Groups Round 1 and 2. (See separate summaries for each group).

Preference Exercise. (See preference survey form)

"Balancing the Equation". Kip Harkness highlighted the strong preferences identified through the preference survey, noting that some Task Force members expressed a strong preference for one item. In answering a question about why the "multi-voting" style was chosen, Kip explained that this technique allows people the opportunity to express a preference when looking at an entire package.

Task Force member Bob Levy pointed out that some interest groups would have a narrow interest. Kip noted that for better or worse that is how the preference survey process works.

Chair Cortese observed the value in the preference survey tool that gives discernment of where the next discussions need to occur.

Kip gave retail as an example of an issue that the Task Force was not very "hot" about, and pointed out that the Task Force focused on other topics of concern. He described the "multi-vote" as providing an opportunity for the minority opinion to be expressed.

Task Force member Vince Songcayawon stated that the voting is not statistically valid. Kip responded that the purpose of the preference survey was not to result in a simple majority.

Bob Levy asked if there were too many items on the list, where things could be missed. Kip answered that it was intended as a way to get at the major topics of concern.

Task Force member Khanh Nguyen combining the results of the preference survey with revised amenity list information for the next Task Force meeting in March. Then Khanh suggested, if the amenities list gets reduced to what is needed/wanted, perhaps then there could be discussion regarding reducing units.

Kip mentioned that the Task Force would get clarity on the amenities list and the survey results could be used as a framework for the next discussion toward achieving a balance.

Laurel Prevetti invited Task Force members to do their homework on balancing the equation and if they had any presentations they would need to get those to John Baty prior to March 8, 2006 for posting on the EEHVS website. Laurel cautioned the Task Force to remember the Brown Act and be clear of who members talk with to make sure the process is open.

Chair Cortese asked if staff could take any Task Force presentations and present them as a neutral party. Laurel Prevetti answered that staff could present them.

Chair Cortese emphasized the importance of respecting the Brown Act and reminded the Task Force that a chain of e-mails could be considered a serial meeting.

Additional Public Comments:

Rhonda Garcia –

There are a lot of problems with the way the City handles meetings.

Would like a revote (preference survey).

Development of the amenities list was a fiasco.

Pleasant Hills Golf Course workshop was a fiasco. It was done wrong. The letter and language of the notice was wrong. There were streets left off of the distribution.

The meetings are skewed.

Don't appreciate that people were left out.

Want open space.

Want another Pleasant Hills meeting.

Whose fault are the problems? Staff, Dave (Cortese), Planning?

Bob Rivet –

Live in Evergreen and work at Evergreen Valley College.

This workshop meeting was better than other meetings.

Pages 7 and 8 in the EIR describe the number of homes built in the area in the last 20 years which equals 50,000 people.

Don't want to exclude people, but want to be able to live.

Page 10 in the EIR describes project objectives and quality of life. Scenarios 4 and 5 won't meet the project objectives.

There are too many people coming in to Evergreen. There needs to be a balance between new people and quality of life.

The preference survey was skewed.

At the last meeting a lot of people wanted to speak.

Jody Pabst –

Pleased to be included in the break-out groups and given the opportunity to express preferences.

Lee Goldstein –

Participated in traffic and schools discussions, which are the areas two pre-existing conditions.

Heard a lot of variables related to traffic and high school. Shouldn't put the cart before the horse. How can the project move forward without having the traffic and high school variables locked-in?

Is there enough money to do traffic improvements and schools?

Tom Yang –

Attended a community meeting over a year ago. 60% of the attendees voted against any new development.

Generally agree with previous speakers on disapproval of meetings.

If there's no "heart" in evaluating proposed development will get more traffic and overcrowded schools.

Ellie Glass –

Jim Zito did a good job on his presentation.

Community is losing open space and quality of life. Developers aren't losing anything.

Would like to have seen more community members attend. Should have been additional outreach.